

A Further  
PROSPECT  
OF THE  
Case in View,  
IN  
ANSWER  
TO SOME  
*New Objections*  
Not There Considered.

---

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold at the Publishing-Office,  
in Bearbinder-Lane, near Stocks-Mar-  
ket; and by most Booksellers in Lon-  
don and Westminster. 1707.

PRCSCT

Case in



Printed and Published  
in London  
by W. Woodcock  
at the British Museum  
1847



---

---

# THE Contents.

## I.

**A** Favour for Peace commendable in this Dispute, as consistent with other Duties. P. 1

## II.

*There can be no Schism of our Churches from other Foreign Bishops, when we have only single unrivalled Altars in the particularly Jurisdictions.* P. 3

## III.

*We cannot oblige our Adversary Bishops to make a Publick Satisfaction for what they have done in*  
A 2 *rela-*

## The Contents.

*relation to the Schism, when  
we have no Bishops of our  
own.* p. 8

### IV.

*Making Publick Satisfaction for what  
has been done under the Schism,  
is not Essential to a Reconcili-  
ation.* p. 13

### V.

*All Prayers in Church Offices, to  
which we cannot heartily Assent,  
do not therefore oblige us to  
separate from the Church's Com-  
munion. Not even all such as are  
False or Immoral, when neither the  
Church, nor the Communicants  
can be justly blamed for them.*

P. 19

### VI.

*It will not be justifiable for Private  
Communicants to forbear our  
Church's Communion, on Account  
of such Prayers.* p. 28

### VII.

## The Contents.

### VII.

*Nor to keep out of all Communion,  
or to join in any opposite Commu-  
nion in the same Districts, on that  
same Account.*

P. 36

### VIII.

*Our Presence in the Communion,  
where such Prayers are used, is ve-  
ry consistent with a Guiltlesness  
of the Sin or Scandal of them.*

P. 44

### IX.

*Such Prayers are not the fault of the  
Communicants; and may some-  
times not be the Fault even of the  
Governours of our Communi-  
on.*

P. 51

### X.

*Such Prayers may be secured from the  
Scandal, if the Officiating Clergy  
will refuse to read them, or the Au-  
ditors do notifie their Dissent by  
not answering Amen.*

P. 59

### XI.

## The Contents.

### XI.

*No one Church Communion can hold long, if different Sentiments of Subjects from their Governours concerning Occasional Prayers be allowed as sufficient to excuse Subjects for separating from the Communion.*

P. 70

### XII.

*No Forms are secure from particular Petitions, with which some particular Communicants may not be able to join veraciously.*

p. 80

### XIII.

*Private Prayers were antiently allowed and encouraged in the Places Dedicated to the Use of Publick Religious Assemblies, to which none were obliged to signify their Consent besides those who offered them.*

p. 86

### XIV.

*They were allowed, not only in Private Concernments, but in Publick also.*  
As



## The Contents.

*As when the Prayers were bidden.*

p. 94

### XV.

*The Forms of Prayers, wherein whole Assemblies are concerned to join, are to be prescribed by the Governors of such Assemblies.*

p. 98

### XVI.

*Our Presence therefore at Prayers not approved by us, does not imply our being of the same Mind, but only that we own our selves Members of that Body, which is to be concluded by the Authors of such Prayers, which we must own, though we be not of the same Mind.*

p. 111

### XVII.

*Our Presence at the Publick Offices, without assenting to the Immoral Petitions, Accounts for both our Duties, both to our Spiritual Superiors, and to our Private Veracity.*

p. 120

### XVIII.

## **The Contents.**

### **XVIII.**

***Our Presence at the Immoral Petitions will not oblige us to answer Amen to them.*** p. 126

### **XIX.**

***Our Liberty in not answering Amen to the Immoral Prayers will not excuse our Presence at opposite Communion, nor our refusing that answer to other Prayers of the Communion we profess.*** p. 134

### **XX.**

***Our Dissent to the Impure Prayers will secure us from the Impurity of the Worship.*** p. 147

A Further

# PROSPECT

OF THE  
CASE in View, &c.

Honoured Sir,

I Am glad to find you  
qualified for the En-  
quiry on which you  
are pleased to employ  
me, with a Commendable  
Favour to *Peace*. Our Blessed  
Lord has intitled it to a *Bea-  
titude*. Meaning it, no doubt,  
no otherwise than as it is  
consistent with our *other Du-  
ties to Truth*, and the *Inte-  
rests*

i.  
A Favour  
for *Peace*,  
commend-  
able in  
this Dis-  
pute, as con-  
sistent with  
other Du-  
ties.

*rests* of the *Catholick Church*; and, I can assure you, that I am heartily ready to join *Issue* on these Terms, which are the *only Solid Foundations* for a Commendable and a *Lasting Peace*. The *Favour* I mean is no other than such as may oblige us to determine *rather for Peace*, where there is *not more certain Evidence* against it, nor any more important *Duties* that are *Inconsistent* with it. I am therefore to examine whether there be either of these *Reasons* in the *Pleas* you insist on, that can hinder our *Coalition* with our former *Fathers and Brethren* whenever it shall please *God* that the *Case in View* shall happen? That is, when the *Sees* of our *Holy Fathers* shall



shall be fairly *vacated* by the  
*Death, or Cession* of the *Right-  
ful Owners*?

I begin, as your self do, <sup>2.</sup>  
with your *later Suggestion*. There can  
The rather, because it has be no  
the nearer Affinity with the *Schism* of  
Question debated in my our Church-  
Book, and will admit of the es from o-  
*easier Resolution* on the *Prin-* ther *Foreign*  
*ciples* there already establish- *Bishops*,  
ed. when we  
You conceive therefore have only  
that *after the Vacancy* of all *Single un-*  
our *Sees*, though there re- rivalled *Al-*  
main no *Schism* in *England*, tars in the  
yet there will still remain particular  
a *Schism* from *other Bishops* *Jurisdic-  
ons.*  
in *Communion* with our *Holy*  
*Fathers*. And you instance  
particularly in the *Bishops*  
of *Scotland*. But, if you will  
be pleased to recollect what  
I have already said in my  
*Discourse concerning the*  
B 2 Case

*Case in View*, you will find that I have obviated this Objection. I have there shewn that the Schism from the Catholick Church diffusive results from the Schism from a particular Church, as Separation from the Communion of a Particular Church obliges the Church in Heaven to reject all from the Heavenly and Architypal Union and Communion, who are any way divided from its Authorized Representative here on Earth; and as Persons so excluded from the Heavenly Communion do thereby lose all Right to all Earthly Communions, if the Governors of such other Communions will indeed maintain a Communion with Heaven, without which their Acts on Earth can expect no Ratification in Heaven; thence

thence it plainly follows, that where there is no Separation from the *Local Church*, the *Right* to the *Cœlestial Union* and *Communion* is still retained. Which will consequently intitle the Person, to communicating with Heaven, to a *Right* to *Communion* with all those *Earthly Churches*, which are of the same *Communion* with the *Church-Power* of the *Jurisdiction* to which the *Communicant* does particularly belong. When therefore there is no *Altar* against *Altar* in *England*, how can there be any *Separation* in *England*? How then can any *Communicant* in *England* fail of the *Benefits* of the *Mystical Communion* in *Heaven*, when he is not separated from that *Communion* which

can alone pretend, in *England*, to represent God and *Christ*, as having *visible Heads* and *Principles of Unity*? And which is otherwise *qualified* for that *Mystical Union*, by being true to all the *Primitive* and *Original Fundamentals*? And how can any other *Church*, that believes the *Church of England* so qualified, refuse her *Communion* to our *Church's Communicants*, when she cannot deny them to have a *Right* to the *Cælestial Communion*, if *Christ* have any *Church* at all in *England*? It will be a virtual *Renouncing* her own *Interest* in the *Heavenly Communion*, if any *Church* should reject from her own *Communion* those whom she has reason to believe entitled to the *Cælestial*.  
Nor



Nor could she reasonably expect that her *own Acts* should be *ratified* in *Heaven*, if she should *refuse to ratifie* the *Acts* of the *Heavenly Communion* here on *Earth*. And *Encroachment* on *Jurisdictions* already *possessed* must needs make the *Schism* imputable to the *Encroachers*, where the *common Faith* is already *secure*. Nor can any *Domestick Schism* be pretended, where there is no more than *one Altar* in *England*. Nor can there consequently be any *Schism* from any *Foreign Church* on the *Principle* now mentioned: That all *Schism* from *Foreign Churches* must be fundamentally grounded on a *Schism* from the *Jurisdiction* to which the *Schismatick* belongs, and the *Right*

*A Further Prospect of*  
 that Church has to oblige all  
 Foreign Churches to ratifie  
 whatever is necessary for  
 asserting her own Right with-  
 in her own Jurisdiction.

3.  
 We cannot  
 oblige our  
 Adversary-  
 Bishops to  
 make a  
 Publick Sa-  
 tisfaction  
 for what  
 they have  
 done in re-  
 lation to  
 the Schism,  
 when we  
 have no Bi-  
 shops of our  
 own.

But you conceive *Satisfa-*  
*tion* necessary as a previous  
*Condition* for renewing our Com-  
*munion* with those who have  
 been the *Authors* of the pre-  
 sent *Schism*. No doubt it  
 were much to be wished, to use  
 the Words of our own Church  
 in a like Case; and that,  
 not for *Retrospection* only, but  
 also for asserting the *Rights*  
 of the Church, and preventing  
 the like *Schisms* for the future.  
 Nor would our Adversaries  
 themselves desire the *Reunion*  
 on other Terms, if they had  
 indeed that bare Zeal for our  
 common Mother, and her *Spi-*  
*ritual Interests*, and the revival  
 of

of Discipline, which our Church has expressed in the Words now mentioned. They would, to chuse, lay hold on the present Occasion to make up the Breach themselves have made, on such Honourable Terms as might prevent their unjustifiable Practice from passing into a Precedent, and secure the Church against the like Laical Encroachments for the future. They might have done so without concerning the State Controversie in the Reconciliation, by healing the Breach of Communion, yet leaving us under the same Incapacity of Secular Favours as before. But let us leave them to answer, for this Omission, to God and their own Consciences. Our present Enquiry is

is concerning our *own* Duty in the *Case in View*. And, be pleased to remember that, when *that* shall be our *Case*, we shall all be *then* in the Condition of *private Communicants*, who cannot pretend to any *Right* to give *Laws* of *Communion*, but must be obliged to *receive* them, from those who have the *Power* of the *Sacraments*, if we will have any *Communion* at all. *Penance*, and *Publick Satisfaction*, must be *imposed* (if they be *imposed* at all) as *Conditions* of *Communion*. They can therefore be *imposed* by none but those who have the *Power* of that *Communion*, which may claim a *Right* to be *ratified* in *Heaven*. This none but *Bishops* can pretend to, as I have already shewn  
on



on several Occasions. We cannot therefore *presume* to *impose* any Conditions on our Adversary-Bishops, when we our selves have no Bishops that may exercise Authority over them. We cannot do it, even over the Laity, much less shall we be able to do it over them who have more Spiritual Authority than we our selves can pretend to, when we have no Bishops to Head us, and to Form us into a Communion. We may intreat them to do Justice on themselves, as Synods are said to have done with the Popes Marcellinus and Symmachus ; but, if they will not be persuaded to do it, God will not make us responsible for them, though they should not make the Satisfaction desired.

*sired.* But he may make *us* responsible, if we *continue* an *opposite Communion*, when we have no sufficient *Authority* to do so; or if we do not *reunite* our selves to our present *Adversaries* when *Providence* shall have invested *them* with the *Canonical Authority* of the *Jurisdictions* within which we *live*. Nor will you, I believe, find One *Parallel Instance* for your Purpose in our Reverend and Learned Brother's *Historical Collections*. The *Catholick Orthodox Christians* had their own *Bishops* in all the *Cases* mentioned by you, of the *Novatians*, and *Donatists*, and *St. Chrysostom*. This might *justify* their keeping up a *distinct Communion*; but will not then be pleadable by *us*, in the

the Case we speak of, when we shall have *no Bishops* of our *Communion* in our *National Church*.

I may add farther, That tho' *Satisfaction* be a thing *desirable* for the *Discipline* of the *Church*, and the more effectual *securing* the *Church* from the *Contagion* of *Bad Examples* for the future, yet it has never, that I know of, been insisted on as an *Essential* to a *Coalition*; no, nor as generally prudent, or fit to be insisted on, as a *Condition* of *Reconciliation*. *Themistocles* was for making a *Bridge* of *Silver* for a *flying Enemy*. And *Multitudes* of *Precedents* have been in both *Societies*, the *Secular* as well as the *Sacred*, wherein *Motions* for *Peace* have been readily accepted by

4.  
Making  
Publick Sa-  
tisfaction,  
for what  
has been  
done under  
the *Schism*,  
is not essen-  
tial to a  
*Reconcilia-*  
*tion*.

by the *Supreme Powers* without any dishonourable *Conditions* that might put the *Violaters of Unity* to the *Blush* for any thing *past*, but have left them accountable for what was now out of their *Power* to none but *God*, and their own *Conscience*. The *Catholicks*, at the *Collation of Carthage*, insisted on nothing but that, for the *future*, both *Bodies* might be under one *Bishop*, who might *Communicate* with the *Catholic Church*, by giving *Communicatory Letters* to, and receiving them from the *Body* of their *Episcopal Collegues* of the *Church diffusive*. They required no *Penitential Acknowledgment* of what had been done amiss before, as in the *Case of Private Penitents*. So, in the *Case*



Case of *S. Chrysostom*, nothing more was done that might reflect on his *Rivals*, but what was necessary for doing *Justice* to his *Memory*. His *Adversaries* had *expunged* his *Name* out of the *Ecclesiastical Diptychs*. This was taken for an *Ecclesiastical Excommunication* of the *deceased*. It could therefore have been hardly consistent with the *Reconciliation* intended of the *Two Communions*, if the *Name* of that injured *Saint* had not been restored into those same *Diptychs*, how much soever it might seem to reflect on those who had *expunged* it. Nor were any *harder Terms* insisted on. No *Retrospection* into the *Validity* of the *Acts* of the *Time* of his *Deprivation*, much less  
any

any *Acknowledgment* or *Satisfaction* for them. Other *Examples* I have given in my Book, and might have added *more* if it had been necessary. This was indeed the *ordinary* Way of treating *Bishops* of *equal*, or *superiour* *Authority*, with that which was concerned *against* them. *Bishops* were so far from being *subjected* to *Ecclesiastical* *Penance* ordinarily, that, if they ever had undergone the Office of *Penitents*, that Consideration alone was, by the *Canons* of *those* *Times*, sufficient to make them *unable* of that *Divine* Office of the *Supreme* *Priesthood*. It was therefore very ordinary, upon *Reconciliations*, to receive Persons in Office (much more of this *Supreme* of

of all Ecclesiastical Offices) in the same *Dignity* they had enjoyed in their *separate Communion*; or to qualifie them for the next convenient *Vacancy*. Then especially, when it was safe to *trust* them, and when they had received their Power from Persons duly *qualified* to give it them. But generally without any *dishonourable* Circumstances that I remember of. Especially after the *IVth Century*, wherein the *First Canons*, now extant, were made, as has long since been observed by *S. Isidore of Sevil*. That shews that he knew of none elder *then*. The *Discipline* exercised on the *Ordainers* of *Novatian* was before those incapacitating *Canons*. However I know

C

not

not One Instance of *Penance* imposed on Adversary *Bishops* when the *Orthodox Bishops* were the fewer, which is our present *Case*. But the *Reasoning* will be yet more unquestionable when the whole *Colledge* of our *Bishops* of the *National Church* shall be united against us. Then we can have no *Pre-  
tence* on their undertaking the Persons of Publick *Penitents* as a *Condition* of their *Reconciliation*. Nor can you, I believe, produce One single *Precedent* for it, even from the *Times* of the severest *Discipline*. This therefore can be no *Ground* for *For-  
eigners* to intermeddle in our *Affairs*, nor for us to *fa-  
vour* them in doing so.



I proceed now to your <sup>5.</sup> other Objection, which, I All Prayers in Church-Offices to which we cannot heartily assent, do not therefore oblige us to Separate from the Church's Communion. It relates to the Prayers used in the Publick Offices to which we cannot heartily say Amen. I was aware of this in the Offices concerning Oates's Plot, even after sufficient Evidence had appeared, that the Testimony of him, and such as he was, could not be relied on as an Argument of the Truth of what had been deposed by them. Yet the Offices then imposed generally supposed the Truth of it. And the Prayers then offered were for Things not desirable. But upon that Supposition, must we therefore, even then have been obliged

<sup>5.</sup> All Prayers in Church-Offices to which we cannot heartily assent, do not therefore oblige us to Separate from the Church's Communion. Not even all such as are False or Immoral, when neither the Church, nor the Communicants, can be justly blamed for them.

to *separate* from those *Prayers*, and the whole *Communion* wherein they were used, when *we* were satisfied that the *Witnesses* did not deserve credit, that their *Narratives* were otherwise *unlikely* and *inconsistent*, and that the *Petitions* desired, pursuantly to the *Belief* of them, were therefore *needless* and *unseasonable*, as grounded on *false Suggestions*? Could we have been *excuseable* if we had done so? I may put the Case yet higher. It is very possible that a private Person may *know* that to be certainly *false* which the *Imposers* of the *Publick Prayers* may, upon *probable Evidence*, believe *true*. As if the *Fact* concern *himself*, or any other who was *with* him

him when the Fact is said to have been committed; or, if he know some Circumstances *unknown* to the *Imposers*; which, being known, prove the Fact *impossible*. Must that *oblige* him to *withdraw* from the *Communion* which *uses* those *Prayers* which suppose that *true* which he himself *knows* to be *impossible*, for fear of the *Sin* of a *Lie*, if he say *Amen* to such *Prayers*; or the *Sin* of *Scandal*, by being *presumed* to have *assented* to such *Prayers*, because of his *Presence* at them, though he did not say *Amen* to them? Either of those *Sins*, of the *Lie*, or the *Scandal*, will make the *Communion* unlawful to him if your *Reasoning* be solid and conclusive. How-

ever, in these Instances there are only *Errors* in Matters of *Fact*, though *known* to be *Errors*, and therefore *voluntary*. But neither false *Doctrine*, nor *unlawful Prayers*, in the Opinion of the *Church*, whose *Communion* the Person we speak of is supposed to *own*. I give another Instance, wherein there is *both*, which is certainly of *more* Consequence than where the *Errors* relate only to Matters of *Fact*, whether the *Falshoods* be alike *known* or *wilful*. In the Reign of King *James II.* we used that Petition in the *Litany*, That God would *keep and strengtben him in the true Wor-ship*. And we were upbraided for it by the *Papists*, pretending, that we doing so,

*own*



own his Popery, then professed by him to be the true worshipping of God ; and that we pray'd God to keep and strengthen him in it. And undoubtedly this Petition was designed for a Prince whose Worship the Church believed true ; such as the Prince was when the Litany was composed ; and ought to have been altered when the Case was altered. That is, when the Prince was not such as that was whom the Compilers of the Litany had in their View, and for whose use that Petition was truly calculated. But to use it for a Prince, openly professing another Faith, and another Communion, is as contrary to her Faith as it was beside her Design. This therefore will

go farther to justify a *Separation*, as Errors in *Faith* are more considerable for that Purpose than Errors only relating to *Fact* and *Practice* can be. What then? Ought we therefore, even *then*, to have *begun* our *Separation* from the Publick Assemblies? No, certainly. We could not have done it without very great *Injustice*. It was very certain that none of our *Church's* true *Communicants* could *believe* these Expressions *true* in the Sense in which our Adversaries are pleased to *upbraid* us with them, how *Literally* soever, or how *Naturally*, that *Sense* might seem to be *imported* by them as they were *used* in *that* Prince's *Reign*. It is certain that the *Church*  
her

her *self* could not approve them, if she would be true to her *own Doctrine*, and even her *own Communion*. Must she therefore *separate* from her *self*? Or, was she also guilty of *Immoral* and *Inconsistent* Prayers if she did not do so? It is certain that those same *Words*, by the *Change* of the *Prince*, had acquired a *different*, nay, a *contrary* Sense to the Sense intended by the first *Compilers* of those same *Petitions*. And can it be *just*, or even *fair*, to charge the *Church* with a *Sense* notoriously *contrary* to that *Sense* which was *really* her *own* *Sense*; and to *separate* from her *Communion* for so *false* an *Imputation*? It is certain that the *Sense* imported by those same *Words*,  
in

in that *Change of Circumstances*, was such as could not be intended by any of our Church's Communicants, if they would be true to the Principles of her Communion. Must they therefore separate from her Communion for a Sense of her Prayers which they could not own for her Sense if they would reason consequently to the Principles of that same Communion? Or, must they be guilty of Immoral Falshoods, by continuing in her Communion if they do not understand those same Words in a Sense quite contrary to what her self meant when she compiled those same Prayers? Where is indeed the Scandal of seeming to approve that new Sense, when there is no other Argument to prove even their



their *seeming* to approve it but that only one, that they *continue* in the *Communion*, when it is withal notorious that none of their *Brethren*, of the *same Communion*, either *do*, or *can*, approve of that *same Sense*, notwithstanding their continuing in it? Where is the *Falshood*, when those Words, in the *new Sense*, though blamed by them, as being judged *false*, are notwithstanding no otherwise understood or approved by them than they *are* and *must* be by their *Fellow-Communicants*? These are they to whose *Understanding* they are obliged to accommodate themselves, if they will indeed approve their *Veracity* as to the *Terms* on which they  
con-

*continue in the Communion. If therefore they continued in the Communion on the same Terms which were expected by their Governors, and presumed by their Brethren of the same Communion, who thought no otherwise of these Prayers than themselves did, I know no Ground of Scruple but that their continuing then in our Communion was very consistent with what could reasonably be expected from their Veracity.*

6. It was, no doubt, intended (as is usual where it may be done) that, upon the Change of the Person prayed for, the Prayers also should be changed which are offered for him. And that, as well in the Petitions as in the Name. It is

It will not be justifiable for Private Communicants, to forbear our Church's Communion, on Account of such Prayers.

is certain that a *Patron* of the same *Communion* is intitled to *Prayers* different from those which he can pretend to, who openly owns another *Communion*, and cannot be expected to be a *Patron* of the *Communion* that prays for him. But what must *private Communicants* do, in the mean time, till that *Change* be made, which is not in the *Power* of *private Communicants*, but only of the *Bishops*? They cannot cordially join in *Prayers* which suppose an *Approbation* of an *opposite Faith*; much less in *Petitions* for keeping and strengthening a *Soul* in a *Belief* which themselves think *destructive* of his *Salvation*. These are certainly as *Immoral* as *Prayers* for the *Prosperity* of an *unjust Cause*.

*Cause.* The *Cause* promoted by such *Prayers* is every Way as *unjust* as the other. But with this further *Aggravation*, that, in the One *Case*, our *Civil* Interests alone are concerned *directly*: In the other those irreparable ones are hazarded, of our *Souls*, and of *Religion*. If therefore *Presence* at such *Prayers* would involve the *Communicant* in the *Guilt* of them, the *whole* *Communion* must be deserted by the *Reasoning* now insisted on. At least, till the *Governors* of the *Communion* shall change the *Prayers*. What then must a *Pious Person* do in the *meantime*? Must he forbear all *Worship* of *God* in the *Publick Assemblies* of any *Communion* whatsoever, till the desired *Change* can be effected?



fect<sup>ed</sup>? Even of *that* Com-  
munion which himself be-  
lieves *Orthodox* in the *Faith*,  
and wherein he finds no op-  
posite *Altars* that might warn  
him of any *Danger* of  
*Schism*? What if he finds  
no *Hopes* that they will, or  
can, be remedied for ever?  
Must he therefore forbear all  
Publick Worship for ever?  
That would be a *Remedy*  
worse than the *Evils* he  
would endeavour to avoid  
by such a *Separation*. It  
would be a *Dissolution* of the  
whole *Body* if all should have  
followed such an *Example*.  
And all are concerned alike,  
and can give the same *Reason*  
as any one can, why they  
should do so too. All are  
alike obliged to avoid *Im-  
moral* and *Sinful Prayers*, as  
well

well as he that should *begin* the Separation. And all that *believe* the Doctrine of the Church of England true, must, in Consequence of that Belief, think the Prayers *Sinful and Immoral*, that, in the *obvious Sense* of them, in that unhappy Prince's *Reign*, implied the *contrary* to what themselves believed. The Society being thus *dissolved*, there could, thenceforward, remain no *Authority*, by which the *Grievance*, so complained of, might be *redressed*. This would therefore be a *greater Mischief* to the Publick than any One *Grievance* whatsoever, that would, by necessary Consequence, make the *Redress* of all *Grievances* impossible, by destroying the *Power* that should redress them.

them. That Power can subsist no longer when the Body is dissolved, by the Union of which it is enabled to Act. This would also further involve all who occasioned the Dissolution in the Guilt of all the Grievances that may follow when the Power is destroyed by which they might otherwise have been prevented or amended. It will charge them also with a greater Guilt than that which they would pretend to avoid by avoiding the Communion, even in Regard of that very Particular for which they thought themselves obliged to avoid it. Had they borne with Prayers, (however fit to be reformed,) and kept up the Body and the Government of it;  
D                      they

they might *hope* for the Reformation of the Prayers, either by a *new* change of the Case in an Orthodox Successor, or by a Canonical Alteration of the Forms, whenever the Church should retrieve the Reverence due to her Authority. But, by dissolving the Body, they would make the Reformation unpracticable, by destroying the Authority that should reform them. And it is certainly a greater Crime, to hinder the Reformation of Immoral Prayers, than to bear with them for a time, till they may be regularly reformed by those who have the Right of reforming them. By bearing with such Forms, till they may be reformed regularly; they would not be responsible to God for intermeddling



*meddling in a Reformation, for which God will not make them answerable, but their Superiors. But, in separating from their Superiors, when they cannot charge them either with Schism or Heresie, they violate their own Duty, for which they must undoubtedly expect that God will make themselves accountable. If this Liberty be allowed of separating for Things impossible to be avoided, no Authority settled by God can have any great Influence on Conscience, no Society founded by him can keep that Authority, nor can it long subsist without it. As certainly therefore as God has settled a Spiritual Authority, nor can it long subsist without it. As certainly*

D 2      there-

therefore as God has settled a *spiritual Authority* coercive over *Conscience*, and founded a *Priviledged Society*, and intended that both should be *perpetual*, and *obliged* all, in their *Stations* to *maintain* them so; so certain it is that he *cannot* be *pleased* with so *frequent* and *easie* *Separations* which are so *destructive* of so *momentous* *Designs* for the *Good* of *Mankind*.

7.  
Nor to keep  
out of all  
*Communion*,  
or to join  
in any oppo-  
site *Commu-*  
*nion* in the  
same *Di-*  
*stricts*, on  
that same  
*Account*.

The same will appear further if you will be pleased to consider the *Consequences* of this *Separation*. One of these Two is, I think, unavoidable. Either they must perpetuate this *Separation*, or join themselves with some other opposite *Communion* with the same *Jurisdictions* in which they live.

*live.* The former State is very uncomfortable, to be deprived of all Sacraments, and all the Ordinary Means appointed by God for Salvation. It leaves them only such Means as are Extraordinary and Uncovenanted. So that unless God do more than he has Promised or Covenanted to do, they cannot hope to attain the End, when they have deprived themselves of the Means by God appointed for it. Their Case would be worse than if they had lived in a Place where no Sacraments at all could be obtained. Their willingly abstaining from them where they may have them, if they please, will cut them off from that only Plea of Equity ( which may

intitle them to *Uncovenanted Favours* ) if they be not very *sure* of the *Sin* of *continuing* in their *Original Communion*, especially if they should *die* in it. The doing so without a very *great*, and a very *evident* *Necessity*, is certainly a greater *Sin* than can reasonably be feared from the *Scandal taken* by others against their *Veracity*, on account of their *Presence* at those *Prayers* which their *Fellow Communicants* are known to *dislike* as much as themselves can, and sometimes may be known to be *obliged* to *dislike* them, on Account of avowed *Principles*. Their *Publick Duty* to their *Communion* is more *Important*, and therefore more *obliging* than any



any Duty incumbent on them in their *Private* and *Personal* Capacity. This Consideration *alone* is sufficient to *excuse* them from their pretended Obligation to concern themselves for other Mens Opinions concerning their *Veracity* in a doubtful Case *not sinful*, whilst they are satisfied in their own Consciences, that they do not assent to *Immoral Prayers*. Especially whilst their Adversaries have no other Argument to prove their Assent besides a bare *Presumption*, grounded on their Presence at the *Communion*, and common Offices, where such Prayers are used. It is a Rule in such *Casuistry*, that, where *Two Duties* are *inconsistent*, the lower ceases to be

a Duty, and the Omission of it to be a Sin, when its Observation must necessarily occasion the Violation of a greater Duty to the Publick, which ought to take Place before Private Reputation hazarded on groundless Pretences. Tho' therefore we ought to take Care to give no needless Offence even to those without, where no reason of greater Moment obliges us to the Thing, for which the Offence is taken; yet where such a Reason intervenes, (as this is of preserving the Spiritual Society,) there it is so far from being a Sin, that it is indeed our Duty to secure our Duty to the Spiritual Society, whatever Offence be taken, either by Adversaries, or even our Brethren, for the Performance

mance of our greater Duty to our Spiritual Superiors, and for securing our greatest Interest by the ordinary Means prescribed by the Gospel for our Salvation, which cannot be secure in a Neglect of those ordinary Means, where they may be had without Violation of a more Important Duty. Must we therefore, for avoiding this intolerable Inconvenience, betake ourselves to another Communion? We cannot do so, unless it be to a Communion that does not own the Communion of the Church destroyed by us, because no other Church can justify her receiving our Church's Excommunicates. We cannot Communicate with any Foreign Church immediately, while we keep at Home. If there-

therefore we will *Communi-*  
*cate* with any such *Foreign*  
*Church*, we can do it no o-  
therwise than by *Communi-*  
*nicating* with some *opposite*  
*Communion*, within our  
own *Jurisdictions*, which  
owns that *Foreign Communion*.  
This we cannot do if we will  
be true to our *Old Principles*  
on which we first *Communi-*  
*cated* with our own *Church-*  
*es* in these *Dominions*. In  
*Communicating* with them we  
owned our selves divided  
from all *opposite Communi-*  
*ons* within the same *Jurif-*  
*dictions*. And that on *Cau-*  
*ses independent* on these of-  
*fensive Prayers*. Thence it  
will follow that the *Cause*  
of our *Secession* can make  
the *Cause* of such *opposite*  
*Communions* within the  
same



same *Jurisdictions* no better than it was *before*. If therefore we judged their *Communion Schismatical* before, we must do so *still*, and must be *obliged* to do so on the same *Principles* by which we judged them *Schismatical* before. Such *Prayers* used in our *first Communion* cannot make *Innovations* in the *Faith* lawful in any *opposite* *Communion* which had been guilty of it *formerly*. Nor can they *Legitimate* any *Sacrilegious Schismatical Authority*, though no *Prayers* be imposed *unfit* to be *assented* to for the sake of the *Matter*. This *Dispute* has not the same *Event* as many others have, where the *Injustice* of One Cause adds *Right* to the other, and makes

makes the *Subjects Duty* manifest and unquestionable. Nor can they find any *Communion* in the *World*, when they may not find the like Pretence for Separation, if they will be scrupulous. If therefore they must bear with such *Prayers*, where-ever they go; why should they not rather bear with them in that *Communion* to which they were particularly obliged by their *Baptism*?

8.  
Our Presence in the *Communion*, where such *Prayers* are used, is very consistent with a Guiltlessness of the *Sin* or Scandal of them.

A *Petition* of this Nature can certainly be no *Sin* of the *Communion*, because it is against the *Principles* of the *Communion*; Why then should the *Communion* be deserted for it? It is no *Sin* in the *Communicant*, because

he

he cannot be supposed to believe that *Faith true*, which is not consistent with the Principles of his *Communion*. And, if this be not supposed, there can be no *Inconsistency* pretended between his *Presence* at his *Petition*, and his *Belief*, that it is grounded on a *false Supposal*, and ought to be *amended*; How then can his *Presence* at it be reasonably judged *inconsistent* with his *Veracity*? There can be no *Scandal* given to the *Church*, or his *Brethren*, when they all profess themselves obliged to believe as he does, and that by *Principles*: Which therefore they must think themselves obliged also to expect from him whilst he owns their *Communion* and

and *Principles*. Where then can be the *Disappointment*, when they know his true *Meaning* in *continuing* in their *Communion*, and find it no other than what *they*, and *he*, are obliged to *mean*, and that by their common *Principles*? How then can *they* charge him with any *Insincerity*, or *Failure* in his *Duty* to *Veracity*, for his *Communicating* with *them*, when they know he *means* exactly, as *they* think him obliged to *mean*, if he will be *Veracious* in his *Communion* with *them*? But our *Adversaries*, (who took this *Occasion* to upbraid us,) took *Scandal* at it. So they might who were *willing*, and *glad*, to find *Occasions* of *taking* *Scandal* at us; and are



are therefore no farther competent *Judges* of *Scandal* given by us, than as their *Arguments* may prove the *Scandal Just* and *Reasonable*. Where their *Arguments* cannot prove it so, we shall have Reason to presume that such *Scandal* is not given by us, but taken by themselves. And, for such *Scandal*, they, not we, are to be responsible. Let us therefore see how they can prove that our *Presence* at the Office of our Church's *Litany* did imply our designing to pray to God to keep and strengthen our Sovereign in an erroneous persecuting *Communion*. If they would deal ingeniously with us, I do not think that themselves did heartily believe that our *Presence* at the

the *Litany* was with any such a *Design* of offering any such *Prayer* for our selves, or of consenting to any *Form* that might import it, as offered in our *Names* by others for us. Nor do I doubt but that themselves believed the contrary, that we would have refused to have joined in it, if we had been left to our own *Liberty*, and if we could have refused it without *Violation* of the *Communion* professed by us. And that for this demonstrative Reason, because it was so inconsistent with our *Interest*, as well as our *Principles*, to consent to any such *Petition*, whilst we professed the *Communion* of the *Church of England*, with whose *Interests* such a  
*Petition*

*Petition* is so manifestly *in-*  
*consistent*. How then can  
they, at the same time,  
pretend that our *Communion*  
with that same *Church*  
gives the many *just* Occasion  
for *believing* any thing so  
incredible concerning us,  
when they know, in their  
*Consciences*, that we cannot  
mean as they pretend we  
mean, by that very same  
*Argument* that we are of  
this *Communion*? And if  
our *Communion* do not prove  
it, but the contrary, how  
can they pretend our *pre-*  
*sence* at the *Office*, where this  
*Prayer* was used, a *just*  
*Ground* for the *Scandal* they  
are pleased to take at us,  
with any *Consistency* with  
their *own* *Veracity*? We  
*private Communicants* could  
E not

not avoid our Presence at that Prayer, by forsaking the Communion wherein it was used, without forsaking a Communion that disapproved it, and thought itself obliged by Principles to disapprove it as much as we our selves. How then could this be pleaded as a good Reason for forsaking the Communion, that we disapproved that Prayer? And how could our Presence at that Communion be fairly interpreted as an Argument of our approving the Prayer? If it be not, where then is the Ground for making our Practice, in continuing in the Communion where the Prayer was used, an Argument of our Insincerity? And if there was neither Falshood nor Scandal in continuing in



in the *Communion*, I cannot conceive how *we* could have excused our selves in leaving it.

It was very true, that the *Prayer*, we speak of, ought to have been changed.

But till it might be changed Regularly, there was nothing that could excuse, much less justify, a Separation for it. Where-ever

the fault was that continued it, it was certainly not imputable to the *Communion*, and could not therefore be imputable to the *Communicant*, as a Sin for continuing in that *Communion*, which was no way fairly chargeable with it. The fault could not be justly charged on the *Communicant*, but the *Governours*, who had alone the

9.  
Such *Prayers* are not the fault of the *Communicants*; and may sometimes not be the fault even of the *Governours* of our *Communion*.

Right of redressing Publick Offices by the Nature of the Constitution. The Governours

therefore can *alone* be liable to the Blame of it, when it is indeed *faulty*, not the *Communion*. Because the

*Communion* obliges them to reform what is amiss in Matters of this Nature, and cannot therefore be *answerable* for the *Faults* of her *Trustees* in Cases wherein they act *contrary*, not only to the *Trust*, but to the *Principles*, of the *Communion* that has entrusted them.

How can we therefore *excuse* our leaving the *Communion* for that, which (if it be a *Fault*) yet really is *not* the *Fault* of the *Communion*? Yet the Case of the *Petition* now mentioned was not so much

much as the *Fault* of the *Governours* of our *Communion*. The *First Composers* of our *Litany* inserted that *Petition* prudently in the *Circumstances* wherein they composed it. It was then fitted to their *Case*, when they had a *Prince* sincerely *professing* their own *Communion*. And all *Communicants* then not only might, but were obliged by *Principles*, to say *Amen* to that, as any other *Petition* of the *Publick Offices*. The change of the *Case* altered the *Signification* of the *Words*, and made them *uncapable* of an *Assent* by the same *Principles* which had made *Assent* a *Duty* formerly. But the fitting our old *Offices* to the new *Case* was not the *Duty* of our same *Ecclesiastical*

*Governours that first Compos-  
ed our Liturgy, but of their  
Successors for the time Being ;  
Particularly of those who  
were then Living, when the  
Case was altered by our ha-  
ving a Prince who openly  
professed himself of another  
Communion. These had  
alone been answerable for  
the Neglect, if the Grie-  
vance might have been re-  
medied by their Diligence ;  
That is, if it had been real-  
ly in their Power to have  
made the Alteration necessary  
upon the Change of the Secu-  
lar Successor. But it was  
not really in their Power to  
make that Change, how  
desirous soever they had been  
to have made it. To have  
acted separately in their sin-  
gle Jurisdictions might  
have*



have proved of Fatal Consequence to their Unanimity at such a Dangerous Time, when Enemies, under the Patronage of the King, their Proselite, were ready to inflame the Misunderstandings that might have been occasioned by it, and take Advantage from them for promoting their own destructive Designs. They would, no doubt, have represented under very odious Aggravations, if any Attempt had been made to change the Prayers for the Prince, as an Argument of their Disaffection to him. And the Terrors must have been greater when the Bishops had been thus attacked singly with *Præmunires* and the other Severe Laws

*A Further Prospect of*  
of Henry the VIIIth, interpreted by *Romanists*, though designed at first in Defence of the Supremacy, and in Favour of the Reformation. And the Severities used against the first Amenders of these Prayers would have terrified their Brethren from acting Separately, more than if they had been United in a Body. Yet their acting in a Body would have more provoked, and have been more liable to the Laws, as interpreted and executed by their professed Enemies. The mildest of their Instructions, that could have been expected, would have been the Imprisonment of our Bishops, which should have ordered the change of the Prayers. And that would have  
deprived

deprived us of the Use of all their *Episcopal* Authority for the *Remainder* of that *Reign*. I mention not now the *Animosities*, and perhaps *Schisms*, which might have followed among the *Bishops* themselves thus Acting *singly*, which must have disabled them to remove the *Scandal* of these *Prayers*. Let us suppose them to have endured this Trial, and to have persisted in their *Patience*, and that *Unanimously*, what further *Security* could have been given for the *Obedience* of their *Clergy* and *People* of their own *Communion*, in using the *Offices* so amended, and amended by the *lawful Episcopal Authority*? None that I can foresee under this *Latitudinarian* Lea-

Leaven of our unhappy Age. None till God shall be pleased to revive the *Primitive* Notions of *Subjection* in all our Fellow *Subjects* of the same *Spiritual* Authority. Without this the Authority could only have exposed it self, but could never have been able to have cleared the Office of this unlawful Prayer. How many *Schisms* must these unpracticable *Endeavours* (for amending this Prayer) of even our *lawful* Authority have involved us in, both from our *Spiritual* Superiors, and among our selves, which were more happily prevented by our bearing with it, and never offering to separate for it? Thus it appears, that even our *Bishops*, of that time, could



could not have been justly blamed for that which it was not in their Power to remedy. What Justice then could it have been to have separated from our Communion for a faulty Particular in our Liturgy, for which neither the Communion, nor the Governours of it, can be justly blamed?

In such a Case as this, of a Prayer that grows unpracticable, and irreconcilable with the Doctrine of the Communion, only by the change of External Circumstances; every one should do his own Part, but still with Regard to their several Offices in their due Subordination, and with Regard to the Safety of the Common Society. The Regular Way of Amendment is indeed

10.  
Such Prayers may be secured from the Scandal, if the officiating Clergy will refuse to read them, or the Auditors do not rise their Dissent by not answering Amen.

indeed by a *Prohibition*, or *Reformation*, of it by the *Governours*, if it may be had, a *mutinous* *Reformation* being more destructive of the *Authority*, and consequently of the *Society*, than the *Evil* that is pretended to be remedied by it. But if *Authority* cannot be consulted, or cannot *interpose*, (as in the *Cases* concerned in our present *Dispute*,) it concerns the *Ministers* who officiate not to offer *Petitions*, in the *Name* of the *Church* inconsistent with the *Church's Principles*. This would both free the *Communicants* from the *Suspicion* of seeming to consent to such *Petitions*, by their *Presence* in the *Assemblies* where they are offered ; and would free

free the *Bishops* from the  
Odium of *forbidding* them, who  
have not that Occasion of  
*signifying* their Dislike of  
them, by actual *refusing* to  
*read* them, without unpra-  
cticable Attempts, which  
might ruin their *Authority*  
as well as their *Persons*. It  
might also, by *Degrees*, re-  
trieve that *Obedience* to the  
*Authority* of the *Bishops*  
(without which the *Autho-  
rity* itself cannot be availa-  
ble for *clearing* the Church of  
the Scandal of such *Prayers*)  
by the voluntary *Unanimity*  
of the *Officiating* Clergy in  
*forbearing* them. And this  
is the Case wherein, if in  
any, all have Reason to be  
*unanimous*, because all who  
*officiate* in the same *Communi-  
on* have the same Reason  
that

that any one has to make a Conscience of using them, as being contrary to the Principles of their whole Communion. And, where the Case is manifest, they have as great Reason to presume on the Bishop's Consent, as they commonly do when they change the deceased Prince's Name for that of his surviving Successor, as knowing it contrary to the Principles of the Body to pray for the Deceased. Here they may withal be very safe in presuming it, because they know the Obligations incumbent on him for giving his Consent if they had desired it. They know his Obligations to Rule according to the Canons and Constitutions of the Church when he was made



made a *Bishop*. They know his Subscriptions to the *Articles* and *Liturgy*. They know his particular Engagements as a *Bishop* of the *Church* of *England* to be true to its Interests, at least, as to its *Characteristicks* as a particular *Communion*, in Opposition to all *Schismatics* within his own Jurisdiction, and to all *Foreign Jurisdictions* which refuse *Communion* with him and other Churches acting on the same Principles. And they know withal how inconsistent these Obligations are with any *Approbation* of such *Prayers*. And they know these Things with an *Evidence* and *Certainty* greater than any that can be produced for any *Humane Fallible*

*ble Authority, and therefore greater than that by which they know their own Duty, to quit their own Sentiments in Deference to his Authority. Withal they know our Legal Presumptions concerning Wills not clearly exprefs'd, that they suppose the Testator a Good Man, and to mean as he ought to mean if he would approve himself to be so. Now it is but common Equity to presume the same concerning the Bishop of their Jurisdiction, that he also means as he ought to mean by the Principles of the Communion professed by him, at least, till he declare himself to the contrary. The rather so, because they very well know that he cannot so declare*

clare himself without rendering himself justly *suspicious* to the *Communion*, which intitles him to his *Authority* over those who are of it within his *Jurisdiction*. This therefore being done by all the *Officiating Clergy* on so justifiable a *Presumption*, could not possibly hurt his *Authority*, nor hinder the *Deference* which is *due* to him as a *Catholick Bishop* of the *true Communion*, because it imposes nothing on him but what is necessary to be *supposed* in him as a *Catholick*, and as of the *true Communion*, according to the *Principles* of the *Church of England*. For all things consequent to his being so, it leaves his *Authority* as *absolute* as himself can *desire* for the *Good* of the *Communion* professed by him. But this

F

Una-

*Unanimity of the Clergy in not reading such Prayers, would effectually secure the Church from the Scandal of them, though the Bishop should concern himself no farther in it than by his Silence. For, if such Prayers were never read, there could be no Pretence that the Presence of any private Communicant at our Ecclesiastical Offices and Assemblies, should be taken for an Argument of his Approbation of them when they were not used in our Assemblies. However, tho' the Officiating Clergy could not be prevailed on to forbear the offering up such Prayers in the Name of their respective Congregations; yet, even the Laity themselves may forbear their Part, of signifying their Assent, by answering*  
*Amen*



*Amen* to them. And they may justify their Omission of that Response by the known Principles of the Communion, without any Reflection on the Governours of it. This will better appear if their Case be known, yet never taken Notice of by any publick Censure. And they would have no Reason to fear any such Censure from Governours acting on the common and known Principles of their Communion. In this Case they would have Reason to presume that they have the Leave of their Governours, when they know them obliged to grant them the Leave presumed by the same Principles of the same Communion. And by how much their Case of thus signifying their Dissent to

such Prayers, by forbearing the *Response*, which signifies their Assent to their other Prayers, is more notorious, by so much the stronger Reason they have for that *Presumption*, (if the *Bishop* takes no publick Notice of it,) that the *Bishop* does not disallow their Libery in this Particular. Especially if there be *Multitudes* that take the same Liberty, without any Signification of Dislike in the *Governour*, whose Office it was to signify his Mind concerning this *Omission*, if he did indeed dislike it. Nor is there any Reason to expect that the *Bishop* should signify his Mind more expressly in such a Case as this is. That is, when there are no new Prayers inserted in the common Offices

ces by any *new* Episcopal Authority, but the Signification of the *same* Prayers is changed only by the *extrinſick* change of the *Persons* for whom they were originally designed: Or when the *Bishops* are disabled to exercise their lawful Authority in ſuch a Way as may ſecure their *Unanimity*, without which we could not hope for the deſired Succeſs. However, when this Signification of a *Dislike* is known, but not *cenſured* by the *Spiritual Governours*, nor *Aſſent* required from ſuch *Diſſenters* as they would approve themſelves *veracious Communicants*; this, at leaſt, would be apparent, that an *Aſſent* to ſuch *Prayers* is not inſiſted on as a *Condi-*

on of their *Communion*. And this will be sufficient to show that the *Communicants* cannot be under any *Obligation*, on Account of those *Prayers*, to leave the *Communion* that uses them. And it may suffice, to clear the *Conscience* of the *Communicant* from any Suspicion of *Insincerity* or *Scandal* in such acts of *Communion*, when it shall thereby appear that his continuing in the *Communion* is indeed no *Argument* of his *Approbation* of such *Immoral Prayers*.

11.  
No one  
Church  
*Communion*  
can hold  
long, if dif-  
ferent Sen-  
timents of  
Subjects  
from their  
Governours  
concerning  
Occasional  
Prayers be  
allowed as  
sufficient to  
excuse Sub-  
jects for se-  
parating  
from the  
*Communion*.

In truth such *Prayers* in the Name of whole *Bodies*, to which every *Individual Member* of the *Bodies* cannot heartily assent, are unavoidable in any great *Body* whatsoever. Nor can the  
Unity



Unity of any Society hold long that is confin'd to so ticklish and contingent Conditions. Sometimes the Corruption of the Governours, sometimes their Mistakes, sometimes that of the Subjects, and yet, on both Sides, consistent with great Sincerity, may cause a Difference in Opinion concerning Occasional Prayers between Governours and their Subjects. Sometimes the change of the Signification of the Prayers, by extrinsick changes of the Persons and Circumstances, may make so great a change in the Prayers themselves, as that what was not only Lawful, but Prudent too, in the first compiling of it, may cease to be either the one or the other,

ther, *without* any Change or Difference of Opinion, either in the *Governours*, or in their *Subjects*, as in the Case already mentioned. And every Revolution of the *State* upon the Case of doubtful Titles, which have not *Evidence* enough to make all the Subjects of the same Opinion, must in course make a *Schism* in the *Church*, if *this* Exception be too scrupulously insisted on. Nor is it possible, in any long Succession whatsoever, to avoid such Titles. Occasional Prayers are generally grounded on *Facts*, which are often known *Personally* to few, and cannot be notified to far the greatest Part of those who are concerned in the Prayers occasioned by

by them, but by *remote* and very *exceptionable* Testimonies. And, concerning *Facts*, even the *Romanists* themselves dare not generally defend the *Infallibility* of their *Ecclesiastical Superiors*, excepting what has been, of late, attempted by some of the *daring* Order, in their bigotry against the *Jansenists*. Must we therefore have frequent *Schisms* on account of these frequently returning *Occasions*, which are *inevitable* in all *Governments* that are lodged in *fallible Superiors*, and so liable to *changeable* Circumstances, but no way imputable to the *Communities* from which the *Separation* is made? Withal, those *Provisional Prayers* are usually  
the

the Thoughts, not of the *Majority*, even of the *Governours* themselves, or of a *Number* sufficient to conclude the *Absents* by any Rules of Government; but of those only who are *near* at Hand, and can be *consulted* in the small *Respite* that can be allowed for consulting them. Nor will the *Nature* of Government allow that it should be otherwise. So little Reason there is for concluding the *Sense* of the *Church* her self from such *Provisional Prayers*. Why then should the whole *Communion* of the *Church* be deserted for what may be the *Sense* of a very *small* part of it, and may be as much *against* the *Sense* of the *Majority* of it, as it is *against* the *Sense*



Sense of those *particular Communicants* who are supposed to *separate* for it? And where can they betake themselves, upon their *Separation*, where they will not find the same *Inconveniences*, and as frequent, as in the *Communion* deserted by them? Where can they find a *Communion* in the *World*, where the *Governours* are not liable to the like variety of *Opinions* concerning *Secular Titles*, sometimes really *Litigious*? Must they therefore have no *Prayers* for their *Governours* at all? That *both* the differing Parties will think inconsistent with the *Apostles* Prescription to the contrary. But it is impossible in that Case to prescribe any  
Form

Form wherein both *Parties* can agree. If therefore there must be a *Compliance* of one Side, so far, at least, as to bear with the contrary Sentiments in their common Offices, while such Prayers are not imposed as Conditions of Communion, the Favourers of the *Secular* Government will take it for their own *Prerogative* to carry their Cause in this Particular. And they will, no doubt, determine that the Prayers offered in Churches possessed by the Favour of the *Secular* Power, should be offered for that Competitor by whom they are maintained in the Possession of the Churches wherein the Prayers are made. This Plea our Adversaries have against

es  
re  
ne  
to  
y  
n-  
ch  
as  
ne  
o-  
or  
r-  
r-  
ll,  
at  
b-  
of  
be  
or  
n-  
ne  
y-  
ea  
a-  
ft

gainst us now, whilst we have *Spiritual Governours* to oppose to the fallen *Spiritual Governours*, who have a *Right to legitimate* our *Publick Offices* in the *Name* of our *Body and Communion*. But what *Right* shall we be able to pretend in the *Case in View*? The whole *Right* of *Publick Offices* wherein the *Communion* is represented, will be then in our *Adversary Bishops* alone, whether the *Communion* be represented in the *Churches*, or in our *private Assemblies* for the *Celebration of Sacraments*. How shall we then be able to *justify* our encroaching on the *Right* of our *unrivalled Superiors* in their *Prerogative of imposing Publick Offices*? Those therefore ought

ought to be taken for certain *Criteria* in *Reasonings* of this Nature. God ought not so to be understood in his *Obligations* to *Veracity*, as to make his own *Establishments* *inconsistent*, and no way *answerable* to his own *Design* in making them. Seeing therefore it is certain that he has made his *Church* as a *Society* ordinarily necessary to *Salvation*, he could not allow the *Subjects* such a *Liberty* of *separating* from its *Communion* as would excuse them for *separating* for *Reasons* which must frequently occur under *fallible Superiors*. Such a *Reason* this would be, of *whole Offices* of *Prayers* agreeable in every *Particular* with the *private Sentiments* of every *single* Com-



Communicant, who is obliged to be present at them. If such frequent Separations of scrupulous Persons be justifiable, no numerous Body can long preserve its Unity, nor could any fallible Government long secure Obedience. God would not therefore have confined the Ordinary Means of Salvation to them, if so great Numbers of very well-meaning Persons could not expect Salvation by them. This therefore must be as certainly false, that such Scruples as these concerning Prayers prescribed by Superiors are sufficient to excuse a Separation, as it is certainly true, that God has made a Body, and Submission to the Government of it, Ordinarily  
neces-

necessary to that *Salvation*, which he designs that it shall be *actually* attained by, at least, the *generality* of *well-meaning* Persons.

12.  
No Forms  
are secure  
from parti-  
cular *Peti-*  
*tions* with  
which some  
particular  
*Communi-*  
*cants* may  
not be able  
to join *Ve-*  
*raciously*.

It is really *impossible* to have any *General Communion* of a whole numerous *Body*. If it might *excuse* particular *Communicants* from their *Duty* to the *Communion* professed by them, that every particular *Petition* is not adapted to the particular *Sentiments* of each *Communicant*, and if it were withal *inconsistent* with their *Veracity* to be *present* at the *use* of those *Petitions* which were *not* so; and they were no way *concluded* by the *Sense* of their *Superiors*, even when *different* from their *own* *Sense*. The *single* *Votes* of  
any

any very numerous *Body* cannot possibly be *collected* (no, nor if even the *Majority*,) as often as there is an occasion of *new Prayers*. Yet even a *Majority* can do no more to make the *Presence* of even *smaller Numbers* of *Dissenters*, at *Prayers* not fitted to their particular *Sentiments* consistent with their *Veracity*, than the *Sense* of their common *Superiors*. That is, no otherwise than as the *smaller Number* of *Dissenters* ought to be over-ruled and concluded by the *Majority* of *Suffrages* of their common *Body*. Thus it is in all *Publick Forms*, whereby the *Sense* of whole *Bodies* is usually represented. Nor does the *new Invention* of *Ex-temporary Forms* solve the

Matter better. Even *they* are *prescribed* Forms to all that are present in the *Assembly*, excepting the *Orator himself*. And there must be less *Forefight* of what *others* can join in, upon so little *warning*, than in the *Issues* of more *sedate* Thoughts, and of *Authorized Assemblies*. They who are *least* wanting to *themselves*, in contributing what they can by their own best *Endeavours*, have the best Title to the *Divine Assistance*. And the *Prayers* of *Two* or *Three* in an *Assembly* have a Promise of *Christ's Presence* among them which is not made to their *separate Inventions*. And *Men Authorized* by God *himself* to present his *Peoples Prayers*



Prayers to him have a peculiar Gift of the *Spirit* given them when they receive their *Orders* for the Benefit of the *Publick* more than *themselves*. Why then may they not expect a larger Measure of the *Spirit* of Prayer and Supplication? If therefore even *these* may fail in representing the *Sense* of all that are concerned in *Publick Assemblies*, much rather *they* may fail which can pretend no higher than to the Productions of *natural Parts*, and *private Spirit*. If any *Forms* could be thought of *not* liable to this *Inconvenience*, we might most probably expect it in *David's Psalms*. They were the *ancientest* Liturgical *Forms* we know of, both in

*A Further Prospect of*  
the *Jewish* and the *Christian*  
Church, and had withal  
that *higher* Degree of *Divine*  
*Assistance* and *Inspiration* in  
their first *Composure*, to  
which no *late* *Forms* can  
pretend. Yet what *David*  
speaks in the Person of a  
*King* would not fit the Per-  
son of a *Subject*. What he  
speaks as a *Man* cannot be  
repeated by a *Woman* in her  
*own* Person. What he says  
as an *Old Man*, or as a *Young*  
*Man*, cannot agree to any  
that are not of the same  
*Age* with *himself*, when he  
wrote those *particular Psalms*  
wherein he uses these *par-*  
*ticular Expressions*. No more  
can his *Eucharistical Psalms*  
beit the Condition of *Mourn-*  
*ers*, nor the *Pænitential* ones  
the State of *Rejoicers*. Espe-  
cially

cially when they return in  
Course, and are not particu-  
larly adapted to the parti-  
cular Providences of the Sea-  
sons wherein they are used.  
And, even when they are  
indeed fitted to the Circum-  
stances of the Church, they  
may still be as different as  
ever from the Case of the  
Communicant. Must he there-  
fore separate from the Commu-  
nion of the Church when his  
predominant Sorrow, even  
for the greatest Concerns of  
his Soul, hinder him from  
partaking in the Church's  
Joy; or when the Tran-  
sports of his Heavenly Exul-  
tations over-ballance his pre-  
sent Sympathy in the Church's  
Sufferings, so that he cannot  
be conscious of those ardent  
and inflamed Passions that

are imported by the *Pathetical Expressions* of the *Publick Offices*? If this be allowed, there can never be a *lasting Communion* of such *Numbers* as God has been pleased to oblige to *constant Communion*.

13.  
*Private Prayers*  
 were antiently allowed and encouraged in the *Places Dedicated to the Use of Publick Religious Assemblies*, to which none were obliged to signify their *Consent* besides those who offered them.

The best *Expedient* I can think of, for satisfying *Conscience* in Affairs of this *Nature*, is this, to remember that the *Publick Offices* are principally designed for the use of the *Publick*, and are therefore to consist of *Petitions* wherein the *Publick* is concerned, of which the *Governours* are the only *Proper and Authentick Judges*; and that in Matters of this Kind *private Persons* are to be *concluded and over-ruled* by their *Governours*, (in Case they



they differ from them in their Opinions concerning the *Expediency* of Prayers for the *Publick* Good,) whatever other *Advantage* they may have of their *Governours*, in regard of better *Information*. This I conceive to be the *fundamental* Mistakke of our Brethren in this Dispute, that they think the *Publick* Offices to represent the *Sense* of every particular Member of the *Body* concerning the things mentioned in the Prayers, and their *private* Opinions concurring with the *Publick*; and that they think the *Amen* implies it, which whosoever cannot answer *veraciously*, is by this Reasoning therefore obliged to *separata* from the *Communion*.

G 4

*nion.* And there is no doubt but that *private* Prayers were *practised* and *encouraged* in those *Times* in the *Places* of their *Publick Assemblies*, and that none could offer *such* *Petitions* *veraciously*, who did not heartily *desire* them. For *such* there were *Seasons* allowed in the *Publick Solemnities*, both of the *Jews* and *Heathens*; that is in the *Intervals*, when the *Priests* were making their *Oblations* in the *Adyta*, and had no *Leisure* to attend to the *verbal Offices*. These were *private*, as expressing the *private Sense* of the *Petitioners* in his own *Words*, if in *any Words* at all. For it was at his own *Pleasure*, where his *Prayer* shall be *vocal*, or only *mental*. So  
*Hannah*

*Hannah* Prayed for her Son. So the People prayed *without*, while *Zacharias* officiated at the *Golden Altar* of *Incense*, in that part of the *Temple* which was not *accessible* by any but *Priests*, while they were employed in that holiest Part of their *Office*. Such were the *Prayers* mentioned by *Juvenal* and *Persius*, which even the *Petitioners* themselves were *ashamed* of, and therefore were not *desirous* of being *heard* by any but the *Deities* to whom they offered them. The like *private Prayers* gave Occasion for the *Oremus* pronounced by the *Deacon* in the *Christian Offices*, to warn them when they were to *discontinue* such their *private Prayers* that they

they might *attend* to those which were offered in the *Name* of *all*. These *private* Prayers none were concerned to *know*, or to *ratifie* with their *Amen*, besides the *Persons* who made them. Yet, the *private* *Persons*, who were *alone* concerned in them, had more Encouragement to *hope* that they might prove *successful* when they were offered in their *Assemblies*, than if they had offered them *singly* in their *private* Closets. One Inducement was the *Holiness* of the *Places* themselves where their *Publick* *Assemblies* were kept, on that very *Account* of their being set *apart* for the *use* of such *Assemblies*. This they had *reason* to hope for, by  
the



the Reasonings of those Times, on account of the Separation itself performed by Persons Authorized to transfer the Property of such Places to Sacred Uses, and empowered by God to receive in his Name what was devoted by the Donors to him. This separating it from prophane Uses, and the consequent Obligation upon Persons there Assembling to behave themselves, while they were there, with more Caution and Circumspection than elsewhere, made it fitter for Divine Appearances and Manifestations than it had been before the Dedication. Besides this, the Office of Consecration (of which we have a very Antient Form in the Dedication

*A Further Prospect of*  
*tion of the Temple by Solo-*  
*mon,)* requested a peculiar  
*Notice of Prayers made in*  
*such a Consecrated Place,*  
*that God would hear in Hea-*  
*ven, and do according to*  
*the Petitions there offered.*  
Not only grant that *Prayers,*  
also made *towards it,* should  
find the like *Acceptance.*  
This made *Daniel,* in his  
*Babylonish Captivity,* open his  
*Window towards Jerusalem,*  
though the *Temple* was then  
demolished, and though he  
thereby *exposed* himself to  
the *Accusations* of his infi-  
dious *Adversaries,* who, it  
seems *expected* he should do  
so from his *Principles* and *Pra-*  
*ctice* before the *Edict* of the  
*King,* which had *then* made  
it *Capital.* Withal, those  
*Consecrating Prayers,* in the  
*First*

*First Consecrations*, were usually seconded by some extraordinary *Significations* of the *Pleasure* of the *Numen*, such as are mentioned in the *Scripture* in the *Dedications* of the *Tabernacle* and the *Temple*. By these the *Consecrators* were satisfied of the *Litation* of their *Sacrifices*, and the *Success* and *Acceptance* of their *Consecratory Prayers*; and that God accordingly would answer their *Expectations*, in hearing their future *Prayers* relating to such *Places*, and performing what should be desired in them. And the same was presumed also after the failing of those *Extraordinaries*, when there were no ominous *Prognostications* to the contrary. To which  
may

may be added, (in Relation to our *Christian Practice*,) the *Promise* of our Lord *himself*, that he would be present *where Two or Three* are gathered together in *his Name*, which *Promise* does not belong to Persons praying *singly*. These Considerations made *Communicants* willing to pray for their *peculiar unknown Requests* in the *Places* appointed for the *Publick Assemblies*. Yet none of their *Brethren* were obliged to second them in such their unknown *Petitions*, by answering *Amen* to them.

<sup>14.</sup>  
They were  
allowed,  
not only in  
*private*  
Concern-  
ments, but  
in *Publick*  
also. As  
when the  
*Prayers*  
were bid-  
den.

This was the Case in *Petitions* of so appropriated a Nature, as that none but the *Petitioner* himself was concerned in them. But  
it



it was not *only* in Affairs of this Kind that private Prayers were used in the *Primitive Christian Assemblies*; they also practised in all those *Forms* of the Ancient Liturgies, where Prayers were *bidden*, but not *prescribed*, though the Subjects were of *publick* Concernment, as they *generally* were in the *Forms* of *bidding*. These *bidden* Prayers were generally of the *Deacons*, who were the *ισακηνεικας*, who put the *several* Persons concerned in the *Publick Offices* in mind of their *Turns*, that they might be managed without *Confusion*. *Bishops* and *Priests* never, that I remember, *bid* Prayers, but use *Forms*, wherein they expected that all the  
Con-

*Congregation* should join by answering *Amen*. This Form of *bidding* therefore used by the *Deacons*, was only a *Recommendation* of the *Publick Necessities* of the *Church* to those *private Devotions* of the particular *Communicants*, for which a *Respite* was allowed when the *Sacerdotal Ministers* were employed in their *Mystical Offices*, in a Voice purposely low, that it might not be understood by any but those who themselves officiated; or in *Intervals* between the *Bishops Orders* to the *Singers* and *Readers* for *New Lessons* or *New Psalms*, which were not (as they have been since the *IVth Century*) *Stated*, but *Arbitrary*. In these *bidden Prayers* there-

therefore no *Forms* of *Words* was prescribed, but every particular *Communicant* was left to his own *Discretion*, how he would express his own *Desires*, whether by any *Form* of *Words* at all, or only *Mentally*. It was sufficient that *all* were agreed in paying for the *things* mentioned in the *Form* of *Bidding*. Yet whether they did so, or *not*, could not be known, but only *presumed*. But here was no *Use* of the assenting *Form* of answering *Amen*, where every one prayed for *himself*, and none concerned himself in the *Forms* of his Fellow *Communicants*. And I am apt to think that this was the *Reason* why this *Form* was appropriated to the Order

H                      of

of the Deacons, who are not Authorized to convey God's Blessings to the People, nor the Peoples Prayers to God, that being the proper Office of *Sacerdotal Mediation and Intercession* between both Parties concerned in the Covenant.

15.  
The Forms  
of Prayers,  
wherein  
whole As-  
semblies are  
concerned  
to join, are  
to be pre-  
scribed by  
the Gover-  
nours of  
such Assem-  
blies.

The Case was otherwise where Priests, of any Kind, were concerned. There the Form of Words wherein the Petition was conceived is always used by the officiating Priest, which left the private Communicants no other Liberty but that of answering Amen when they found it agreeable to their own Sentiments. And I know no Hypothesis whatsoever whereby it can be denied to be the Priests Right



*Right to prescribe the Words of Publick Prayers in the Name of the whole Congregations wherein they offer them. The most clamorous Opposers of Forms in general are themselves most licentious in practising it. Every private Minister among them imposes his least deliberate Thoughts on the whole Body how different soever from the Sense of the greatest part of his Auditors. Nor was it ever otherwise, nor could be, but that the Officiator's Words, as well as Thoughts, must be the Rule to those who are to join with him. Among the Romans it was the Office of the presiding Priest, præire in the verba solennia, not of Vows only, but of Prayers*

H 2                      also.

*Briffon de  
Form. l. 1.  
p. 61. 107.*

also. This left no Liberty of *Words* to those who were concerned, as *Auditors* and *Communicants*, to join in those *Offices* as they were practised, even among the *Heathens*. The same must have been the Case in all other *Offices* which were *Musical*. These must have been certain *Forms*, approved, at least, and received into publick Use by the *Governours* of the *Communion*, whoever they were who were the *Composers* of them. By those *Governours* they were imposed on the publick officiating *Singers*, which Office of *Singers* was received, not only among the *Heathens*, but among the *Jews* and *Christians* also. Nor could they have been fitted to  
*Musical*

*Musical Tunes, (wherein whole Chorus's might join, sometimes together, sometimes in separate Parts) if all the Words had not been ascertained by the Authority from which the Singers received them. Nor could the new Songs have been looked on by the Psalmist himself as such Rarities, if it had been their constant Practice to vary their Forms relating to the same Subjects as often as they met in their Publick Assemblies, as they do who are against repeating the same Forms. These must certainly have been set Forms which are inscribed to the chief Musician. The Words were fixed before they came to him, who was to fix the Tunes*

before the Inferior Singers were to offer them in the Name of the People. Thus it appeared that neither Words nor Tunes were in the Power of the private Communicants. Nothing therefore could be left to private Persons in such Offices but their Amen, as far as that was consistent with their Veracity. The same was also the Case of the Prosaick Prayers offered by the Bishops and Priests in their own Persons, but in the Name of their respective Congregations. These have always been received into Use by that Authority of the Church which Authorized the Liturgical Offices. And that without consulting particular Communicants, or any Majority of them, or any Body of them which



which might any way represent the *Whole*, or conclude the *Absents*. Nor has even *Blondel* himself, who is so concerned for the *Rights* of the *People* of all kinds, observed one single Instance where the *People* were ever consulted concerning *Prayers*, to which their *Assent* was nevertheless expected, and presumed. Yet it had been of the greatest *Consequence* to have consulted them on these Occasions, if every *Difference* of Opinion had been thought sufficient to excuse their separating from the whole *Communion* for preserving the Reputation of their *Veracity*. So clear it is, that the *Clergy* are, and always have been, in an uncontroverted *Possession* of this *Right*, of transacting

in the Name of their *Spiritual Societies*, without particular Delegations to do so. Nor is there any Society that I know of, that is *numerous*, wherein the *same* Power is not allowed to *Governours*, as absolutely *necessary* for discharging their *Trust* upon the Principles of *Government* in *general*, without any particular *Stipulations* for conveying it. Whoever are made *Governours*, are thereby made the *Authorized Judges* of the *Publick Good*, by which the *Sense* of the *Body* is to be determined, as to all their *Motions* as a *Body*. Accordingly all the *Executive Power* is, at the same time, committed to them, to put it in their *Power* to execute what they shall judge for the *Publick Good*

Good, who can judge by *no other Judgments but their own*. And why is *this Power* committed to them, but to enable them to *over-rule all Private Judgments, when different from theirs?* This Difference of *Private Judgments* concerning the *Publick Good*, and the *Animosities* and *Wars* which are the natural *Consequences* of that *Difference*, when there is no more equal *Umpire* to *over-rule* the *Party* that is *judged unreasonable*, is indeed the true *Reason*, obliging *Free Persons* (where the *Right of Government* is derived from *Compacts* of such *Free Persons*) to *enter into Societies*. When therefore they *agree* to *form a Society*, and *settle a Government*, they must thenceforward be *presumed*

ed to agree to transfer this *Right* they had before of insisting on their own Judgments concerning the *Publick Good* to the Authority settled by them, as a more *Impartial Judge* between them, than *each* can be in Relation to his own Opinion. Thus it is in Matters of the *greatest Consequence*, but especially in *Prudentials* relating to present *Circumstances of Time and Place*. These are generally left by the *Supreme Governours* to the *Discretion* of their Subordinate *Delegates*, as best fitted for the Decision of such Matters, by their *Presence* in those *Circumstances* which are incapable of any *general Determinations*. Seeing therefore it peculiarly belongs



belongs to the *Spiritual Governours* to prescribe the *Prayers* which are for the *general Good* of the *Spiritual Societies*, as the most competent *Judges* of the *Publick Good* of such *Societies*, it must much more belong to them to judge of those *Provisional Prayers* which are to be fitted to *present Circumstances*.

This holds in *Governments* derived Originally from *Contracts* of the particular *Members* of the *Societies*, formed by such *Compacts*; but more firmly in a *Government* of that Nature we are speaking of; that is, of a *Government* immediately derived from *God* himself, such as this is of the *Spiritual Society*. As the *Clergy* represent *God*, and can oblige him

him to *ratifie* in *Heaven* what they act by *his Authority* on *Earth*; so it is certain, that as they do not *receive* that *Authority* from the *People*, so neither can they *receive* any *Bounds* of it from them. The only Pretence for the *Peoples* *Restraint* can be as to *that Authority* they have of *representing*, and *obliging* the *People*, because *Prayers* in the *Name* of the *People* may be taken for an *Original Right* of the *People* whose *Desires* are to be expressed in the *Prayers*; yet *Renunciation* of their own *Judgments* is taken for so *essential* to the constituting a *Society* and *Government*, that, when they are once settled, *Communities* are, in the *Civil Law*,

*Law*, taken for *Minors*. As therefore *Minors* are concluded by the Acts of their *Guardians*, (though no *Consent* be either obtained or asked; so the Sense of the *Ecclesiastical Superiors* is sufficient to conclude the *Ecclesiastical Community*, how different soever it may prove from the Sense of many of its *particular Members*. Yet God is also here concerned, as to the Right he also has to determine by whom he will be pleased to accept of those *Prayers* which are offered in the *Name* of the *People*: So he was pleased to declare, in the Case of the *Friends of Job*, that he would not accept of their *own Prayers* for *themselves*, but by the *Meditation* of

of *Job*, who had been injured by their former censorious Discourses. So he also heard the Prayers of *Abraham* for *Abimeleck*, in relation to the Sin of detaining *Sarah* from him. Having therefore appointed the Clergy as the Publick Intercessors in Affairs relating to the Publick Good of the Spiritual Society, God has thereby impowered them immediately to be the Judges of those Prayers for the Publick, which may hope for Acceptance with him, and has deprived Private Members of that Right they might otherwise have pretended of presenting their Prayers for the Publick in their own Words; at least as to the Forms by which they were  
to



to be presented by the Officiating Ministers.

This Point therefore being gained, that the prescribing the Forms of the Publick Prayers belongs to the Right of the Governing Clergy; it will thence follow that no Private Communicant can justify his invading it, but will be answerable if he do so, for all the Consequents that may follow upon it. And this Right is certainly invaded by any Private Communicant, who shall venture to separate from the Communion for Prayers unwarrantable, so long as the Communion is neither Heretical, nor Schismatical: So it would be judged, in the like Case, in any other Society. It is certain that Addresses

16.  
Our Presence therefore at Prayers not approved by us, does not imply our being of the same Mind, but only that we own our selves Members of that Body, which is to be concluded by the Authors of such Prayers, which we must own, though we be not of the same Mind.

*dressés* and *Petitions* are made in our *Parliaments* to our *Princes*, which many *Particular Members* believe not *unreasonable* only, but *unlawful*; yet these *over-voted Members*, when they are *over-ruled* by *Majority of Suffrages*, do not discharge the *Duty of Good Subjects*, unless they acquiesce till they have an *Opportunity* of carrying their *juster Point* as fairly as the contrary has been carried by their *Adversaries*. None could commend their *Justice*, or their *Prudence* either, if they should therefore *leave the House*; but their *Country* would have just *Cause* to treat them as *Publick Enemies*, if they should therefore go over to any *Assemblies* *opposite*

*opposite to the Laws of their Country. That is not all; they are to treat the Law carried against them as a Law of their Country, and the Petition as the Sense of their Body, as much as themselves would have expected it from their Adversaries, if they had carried their supposed juster Cause against them by as great a Majority of Suffrages. Suppose we therefore that the House should order one of their own over-voted Members to present such an Address to the Prince: This was really the Case of one of the most Conscientious Statesmen in the Reign of King Charles II. An Address was then carried unacceptable to the Prince, and*  
I *opposed*

*opposed by that very Person in the House: Yet his Adversaries were not contented with their Success against him there; but, to insult him the more, pitched upon him particularly as the Person who was to deliver it: Yet he did not therefore decline the Office; nor did he think himself obliged in Duty to do so. He knew very well the Right the House had to pitch upon him, as well as any other Member, for Services of that Nature; and that there was no allowed Rule to excuse Persons from those Services, who had been over-voted in carrying the Address, any more than others, when the Majority of the House were pleased to insist on their Right.*



*Right.* He knew withal, that such *Presentation* of it as the *Act* of his *Body* was very *true*, and very *consistent* with his own *private* *Sentiments* to the contrary. Whilst he *opposed* it in the *House*, his *Adversaries* themselves had allowed *himself* the same *Liberty* they had taken *themselves*. And they knew themselves *obliged* by the *Principles* of the *Constitution* to do so. He knew their carrying it *against* him did not oblige him to *change* his *Opinion*, nor was ever *understood* to do so. He knew they had no *Interest* to understand it so, as knowing very well how *easie* it was for his *Case* to become *theirs*, when they should also be *over-voted*

in future Occasions. He knew his very *Act* of *Presentation* implied no such change in his *Private* Opinion, no *Form* of *presenting* it implying that he presented it as his *own* Opinion, but *theirs*. He knew the *Rule* by which it had been carried, as having a *Majority* of *Suffrages*, plainly supposed that that *might* and *ought* to be taken for the *Sense* of the *Body*, which was not the *Sense* of *all*, even *present*, *Members*: And, by *this* *Rule*, he could not *deny*, nor *doubt*, but that it was *really* the *Sense* of his *Body*. How could he therefore *excuse* himself from the *Duty* imposed on him, when it implied no more but his *assenting* to

a known undeniable Truth,  
at the Command of those who  
were Authorized by the Laws  
of his Country, to oblige him?  
He did not offer to excuse  
himself. Nor can I see  
how our Dear Brethren can,  
by the same Parity of Reasoning,  
excuse themselves in  
the Case we are now concerned for. Their Presence  
at the blamed Prayers does  
no more imply their Approbation  
of them, than his Presentation  
of the now mentioned Address  
did that he approved it,  
either before or after it had  
passed the House. His presenting  
it as the Sense of the House,  
though contrary to his own  
private Sense, and his owning  
it as a Duty to do so, by an  
Authority himself owned sufficient to

lay that *Obligation* on him, implied no more than his owning himself as a *Member* of that *Body* which concluded him, ( though dissenting from them in *Opinion* ) by their rightfully prevailing *Authority*. This *Duty* of a *Member* to the common *Body* was that which prevailed with him, not only to be *present* at the *Delivery* of this *Address*, but to be concerned as a *Principal* ( so far at least as a *Subordinate Power* can be reckoned as a *Principal*, in Comparison with others of the same Rank of *Subordinates* ) in the *Delivery* of it, though *contrary* to his *own Opinion*. Nor is there any thing in this *Consideration* also that will not fully reach our *Brethren* under  
the



*the Case in View.* They neither can excuse themselves *then* for living *without* Sacraments, nor can they, by *Principles*, receive Sacraments in any other Communion, by the *Reasonings* already insisted on. Nor will their *Presence* at the Publick Offices, without answering *Amen* to those particular Prayers, imply their *Assent* to them any more than that Excellent Person's presenting the Address did his *Approbation* of it. *Presence* alone is certainly the lower Degree of *Approbation*, if both of them were to be taken for any Degrees at all. If therefore his *Duty* as a *Member* obliged him to present the Address, however otherwise ungrateful to

him, much more their *Membership* must, at last, oblige them to be present at disliked Prayers, especially when they may be so without any Signification of *Assent*; and when they cannot avoid their being present at them without violating their Duty to the whole *Communion*.

17.  
Our Presence  
at the Publick Offices,  
without assenting to  
the Immoral  
Petitions,  
Accounts  
for both  
our Duties,  
both to our  
Spiritual  
Superiors,  
and to our  
private Ve-  
racity.

But you conceive that we cannot be present at the Publick Assemblies, where a stated Liturgy is used, and every Person oblig'd to say Amen to every Prayer of it, without involving our selves in the Guilt of the Immoral Petitions. I should indeed be inclinable to be of your Mind, if what you suggest had been true, that the same Duty to our *Communion*, which obli-  
ges

ges us to be *present* at the *Prayers*, had obliged us to answer *Amen* to every particular Prayer. But the Reasoning now insisted on may let you see the separableness of these Two Duties: That our Presence at the Assemblies of the Body, whose Communion we profess, does not oblige us to be of the same Opinion of the Governours of it in every particular Petition prescribed by them. If both these may be performed at once, it will be the best Expedient for reconciling our Conscience and our Communion. We shall secure our selves from the Guilt of the Immoral Petitions, if we signify our Dissent, by not answering *Amen* to these, as we do the other Peti-

Petitions. This must needs argue our *different* Opinion of *these* Petitions from what we have of the *other* Petitions wherein we do without Scruple join. And on the other Side, if we will *own* our selves *Members* of the *Body*, in whose *Name* the *Petitions* are offered, I cannot see how we can do it on *easier* Terms than those of being *present* at the *Use* of them, *without* any Signification of our particular *Assent*. That very Advantage which they have, as being the *Sense* of the *greater* Part, and as being *imposed* by those who are the *Authorized Judges* of the *Body*, and of what is to be *requested* for the *Publick Good* of the *Body*, (of which they are likewise the *competent*



tent Judges, ) must necessarily entitle them to be fairly the *Sense* of the *visible Body*, how much soever they may differ from the *private Opinions* of *particular Members* of the same *Body*. And their being *Legally* the *Sense* of the *Body*, intitles them to a Place in the *Publick Offices*, wherein the *Sense* of the *Body* is to be represented; and of *private Persons* no otherwise than as they are continued in the *Body* as *Members* of it, or concluded by it as *over-voted Members*. We cannot therefore deny but that they will have an *Ecclesiastically Legal Title* to the Place they shall then profess in our *Publick Liturgies*, by the *Authority* of that same *Body*, of which we shall  
then

then be *obliged* in *Conscience* to profess our selves *Members*, when we shall have no *other* *Authority* to *oppose* to it which may any way pretend to *conclude* dissenting *Members*. Nor can I see how we can *profess* our selves *Members* of the *Body*, by whose *Authority* we are *over-ruled* by our *Presence* at those *Offices*, where our *Duty* to the *Community* requires our *Presence*, though *Petitions* be used in them, to which we cannot heartily *assent*. We own our *Duty* to the *Government* of the *Society* by being *present* at their *Publick Assemblies*, when they are pleased to *require* it from us. And we do, at the same time, own that our *Compliance* therein is not derived

rived from our being of the same Opinion, by abstaining from the *Response* by which *Assent* is usually signified. And by our *Presence* on those Terms we both ratify the Authority of imposing Forms in the *Publick Offices*, contrary to our private Opinions. Nor shall we, in either Particular, violate, but comply with, the Duty of our private Stations; and that without involving our selves in the Guilt of the *Immoral Petitions*, which are *Immoral* only in them who *Assent* to them. I beseech our Dear Brethren to consider these Things sedately and impartially, as Lovers of Peace where it is consistent with a good Conscience.

Again

18.  
Our Pre-  
sence at the  
Immoral Pe-  
titions will  
not oblige  
us to an-  
swer Amen  
to them.

Again I shall intreat them to consider what Ground there is for what you are here pleased to suppose without any Proof at all, that all who are present at the *Immoral Petitions*, are obliged to say *Amen* to them. I here presume that by *Obligation* they mean an *Obligation in Conscience*; no other *Obligation* can excuse from separating from the *Communion*, on Pretence of this antecedent *Obligation* which they fear they should violate if they should continue in the *Communion*. I presume further that they mean this *Obligation of Conscience* derived from the Act of their *Governours*, as intending to lay this *Obligation* on their *Conscience*, in Pursuance of that



that *general* Obligation God himself has been pleased to lay upon their *Consciences* to be *subject* to those *Governours* whom himself has *Authorized*, and *obliged* the *Subjects* to *obey* them, as well for *Conscience*, as for *other* *Considerations*. This is the *only* *Sense* in which they can possibly mean this *Obligation* on their *Conscience*, whilst they do, at the same time, believe the *Immoral* *Petitions* inconsistent with the *Discharge* of a *Good Conscience*, in regard of *God* *immediately*, and insist on that *Plea* for their *Separation* from the *Communion* of *God's* *Authorized* *Vicegerents*. But how can they *prove* that *even* their *Ecclesiastical* *Governours* intended to *oblige* them to

to answer *Amen* to those *Immoral Petitions*? Yet, if it be not *proved*, it takes away the whole *Pretence* for *separating* from the *Communion*. For if their *Superiors* never intended to oblige them to signify their *Assent* to those particular *Petitions*, they can then pretend no more *Obligation* from their *Subordinate Superiors*, than from *God himself*, in regard of *Conscience*, to signify it. That will leave them at their own *Liberty* to make the *Answer*, though they ought not to take the *Liberty* of *absenting* themselves from the *Communion*. And it is certain that *other Bodies*, wherein things are carried by *Majority* of *Suffrages*, do not impose their own *Sentiments* on

on over-voted *Dissenters*. On the contrary, they usually *allow* them to keep their *Opinions*, so far as it may be consistent with the *Peace* of the *Community*. Nor do they think it *Seditious*, provided they suffer the *Sense contrary* to their *own Sense*, to pass for the *Sense* of the *Body*, when it is fairly carried against them by the *Rules* of the *Constitution*. And if it be a *Petition* in the *Name* of the *Body*, its being presented to the *Person* to whom it is addressed, is a *Right consequent* to the other *Right* it had, to pass for the *Sense* of the *Body* among all *Peaceable, Dutiful Dissenting Members* of the *same Body*. This therefore cannot be *hindred*, by even *such Consciencious Dissenters*,

K

con-

consistently with their Duty to the Body and the Government of it, when the Rightful Governours of it are pleased to insist upon their Right in a Particular of this Nature. It will therefore be a Violation of their Duty to the Body to separate from the Communion for no better a Reason than their private Dissent; because it cannot be done without Invading Rights properly belonging to the Body and its Rightful Government. But this being first secured, that the Dissent be managed with the Modesty which becomes their Subordinate Station, the Dissent alone, with regard to Conscience, is not likely to be blamed by those whose Turn it may be to be over-ruled



ruled *themselves*; and therefore by no *Governours* who may themselves be answerable to a *higher Jurisdiction*. Yet such they often are, as has already been observed, who are the *ordinary Introducers of Occasional Petitions*. A very *small Number* of the *Rightful Governours*, too *few* to conclude the *Majority of Absenters* of their *own Rank* by their *present Votes*. Their *Sense* therefore cannot in *Conscience* be judged the *Sense* of the *Governing Part* of the *Communion*. Nor can it therefore oblige any *Private Communicant* to *assent* to it, on that *Account alone* of his being a *Communicant*. But all *great Bodies* find themselves obliged to *bear* with

such *insufficient* Determinations for a *time*, till more *decisive* ones may be had, if the *Moment* of the thing *deserve* and *require* it. Yet all *Prudent*, even *sufficient* Authorities, are *unwilling* to be understood to *confine* their Subjects *private* Sentiments in things *Occasional* and *Temporary*, where the *Freedom* of their Thoughts *Modestly* insisted on, are very *reconcilable* with the great *Ends* of *Government*, and with *Sincere* and *Pious Designs* for the *Publick Good*. Why should we therefore judge otherwise of our *own* *Spiritual* Superiors, till they be pleased to *declare* themselves to the *contrary*? Nor is there any *likelihood* that they *would* so declare themselves,

selves, though our *Laws* had allowed them a greater *Liberty* to do so than we know they have since the *Encroachments* of *Henry VIIIth*, However, till they actually declare their Design that every particular Communicant should answer *Amen* to the controverted, as well as to the other *Petitions*, we have no reason to insist on a *general Presumption*, that they will do so as a Cause of leaving the *Communion*, because we cannot heartily assent to the *Immoral Prayers*. The rather so, because the *Nature* of the thing itself is such as to afford us better Reason to presume that they will never declare that they intend to oblige us to answer *Amen* to

the controverted *Petitions*. Without this *precarious* *Presumption*, we shall not then be able to plead any thing that can make *their* *Communion* *sinful* to us; which if we cannot do we cannot excuse our *Separation*.

19.  
Our Liberty in not answering Amen to the Immoral Prayers will not excuse our Presence at opposite Communion, nor our refusing that answer to other Prayers of the Communion we profess.

But supposing *Presence* at such *sinful* *Prayers* to be no *Argument* of *Consent* to them, you enquire, *Why* may we not be present at the *Romish Mass*, or any other corrupt *Worship*? This *Objection* would have more *Force*, if *Presence* at a *Communion* did not oblige to a *consent* to any of the *Prayers* used in the *Communion*, if we would act voraciously. But it does not follow, that because *Presence* at a *Communion* does argue



argue a Consent to some Prayers in it, therefore it must do so to every particular Prayer used in the Communion, without which you cannot infer that it must argue a Consent to the Prayers concerned in our present Dispute. We must therefore distinguish where this Argument will hold, and where it will not. This will give you a clear Account why I conceive no Consent to those particular Prayers implied in all who are present in the Offices wherein they are used. Presence therefore at the Prayers of any Communion was, by the Catholick Interpretation of this Practice, judged to imply an Approbation at least of the Communion; especially where

the *Responses* were used to any of the *Prayers* that were designed to signify the Communicant's *Approbation* of them. This implied that the *Communicant* owned himself as one of the *Body*, in whose *Name* the *Prayers* were used by the officiating *Ministers*, who were appointed to represent the *Sense* of the *Body*. And so I also understood our *Presence* and *Affent* to the other *Prayers* to profess and continue our *Union* and *Communion* with the *Body*, wherein the *Immortal Prayers* were used without consenting to the *Prayers* themselves, or involving us in the *Guilt* of them. This Consideration will hinder us from being present at the *Prayers* of opposite

*site Communion*s, though the *Prayers* themselves had contained *nothing* to which we could not heartily consent. So *Prayers* with *Schismatics*, as making us one *Body*, with those who are divided from the *Catholick Church*, must also divide us from the same privileged *Catholick Communion*. So *Prayers* with *Hereticks*, *excommunicated* for their *Heresie*, must make us also one *Body* with them, and accordingly involve us in the same *Excommunication*. That is not all, *Prayers* with any *Body*, when it is a Matter of *Design* and *Choice*, may justly be interpreted as an *Approbation* of the *Terms* of *Communion*, as far (at least) as they

they are known to the Communicant, without which the officiating Ministers could not have admitted him, nor justified their Conduct in admitting him, by the known Principles of their Communion. And because most Communions confine their Communicants to the Catholick Faith, Prayers or Sacraments in any particular Communions must suppose a Consent to all those Particulars which the Governours of the respective Communions have defined as Fundamental. The like may be presumed concerning the Sacraments and Sacramental Offices, and such Offices also wherein all the Governours are agreed, and wherein all the particular Communicants are



are some way concerned, as being of perpetual Use, and immutable by external Circumstances. But there is not the same Reason for Prayers, wherein nothing is concerned that is, even by the Governours of the Communion, imposed as a Condition of Communion; wherein private Facts, and private Persons Rights, and Opinions notoriously disputable, are concerned. These we have no Reason to suspect that Prudent Governours would ever intend for Conditions of their Communion, or that they would therefore expect that they, who are otherwise minded, should signify their Assent by answering Amen to them. They

They know very well that even the *Multitude* of their *present* Communicants are not so *unanimous* in defending these *Prayers*, and the *Principles* concerned in them, as to encourage them ever to make those *Principles* (*Terms* of their *Communion*) which are requisite to justify their present *Practices* and *Prayers* too. Should they venture to do so, they know not how many they should thereby *alienate* of their *best* and most *Consciencious* *Communicants*. They know withal that we act most agreeably to the *Ancient* *Doctrines* of our *Church* received in it ever since the *Reformation*, and consequently to all the *Old*

*Old Terms of Communion.*  
They cannot therefore  
make any *Innovation* in the  
*Terms* of the *Communion*, in  
relation to these *Prayers*,  
without a manifest *Apostasy*  
from their *Principles* for-  
merly received by them-  
selves, as has appeared in  
the *History of Passive Obedi-*  
*ence.* And their doing so,  
is so far from being likely  
to *heal the Schism*, that it  
will rather *aggravate* it  
with the *new Charge of He-*  
*resie*, if they should ever be  
so disingenious as to *justify*  
their *Facts*, so disagreeable  
to the *Old Principles* of the  
*Church of England*, by *new*  
*Principles* calculated to  
serve their *present Purposes*.  
This would be a *Change*  
more *invidious* and *greater*  
than

than I think we have reason to fear from their *Prudence* as well as their *Goodwill* to their *Old Brethren*, who are still their *firmest Friends* by *Principles*, so long as they retain any *Veneration* for their *Old Principles*. They cannot easily think it their *Interest*, for *Politicks* of a *temporary Nature*, and which must necessarily have an *End*, either by *Prescription* on the *New*, or by a *Resettlement* on the *Old Foundations*, to make any *change* in their *standing Principles*, which ought to be *perpetual*; especially considering the *Eternal Usefulness* of those same *Old Principles* for recommending them to the *Favour* of any settled Government



ment of any Sort, when it comes to be *uncontroverted*. These *Restraints* they have from *Providence*, that may hinder them from making their Cause *worse* than it is by *Innovations* in the *Terms* of their *Communion*. However, till they do so, and do it *expresly*, we have no Reason to make our own Condition *harder* than needs by *groundless* and *improbable* Fears. In the mean time we have the Advantage of them, in interpreting their *innovated Prayers* proper to *themselves*, by our *Old and Common Principles*, received by *both* of us before there were any *Temptations* to *Partiality*. So far as their *Facts* and their *Prin-*

Principles are contradictory, it is impossible to observe them both. If therefore one must over-rule the other, the Advantage lyes manifestly on the Side of the Principles wherein we are still agreed, and which they have not yet recanted, nor are ever likely to do by a Consent so unanimous, even among themselves, as would be necessary to make an express Assent to the controverted Prayers a Condition of their Communion. This is a Reason peculiar to these Prayers, which may excuse us from ratifying them by answering Amen to them; but will not be applicable to other Prayers, much less to other Communions. Nor will it only excuse us.

us. It will shew that we act more agreeably to the *Principles* of the *Communion*, when it shall cease to be *Schismatical*, than either the *Introducers* of the *new Forms*, or the *Assenters* to them. For the *Principles* on which we refuse our *Assent*, we shall then have greater *Authority* of our *Communion* itself, than our *Dissenting Brethren* can pretend for the *innovated Prayers*. We can plead the *Authority* of the *whole Body* before the *Schism* of our *Adversaries themselves*, as well as of our *deprived Holy Fathers*. Even *since the Schism*, and *after it*, we can reckon on the *Old Authority*, as continued by our *Adversary Bishops themselves*, till they

L

can

can repeal our Old Principles by a Consent as unanimous of the Bishops for the Time Being, as that was by which our Old Principles were at first Established. Their Practice disagreeable to their Old Principles, can no more be taken for an *Authoritative Repeal* of them by the *Laws* of the Society, than the other Faults of Governours, of what Rank soever, can be fairly taken for a *Legal Repeal* of the *Laws* received by themselves against their own Immoral Practices. The New Prayers are no more than Immoral Practices, even by the *Laws* of the Communion, till they can clear themselves of the Principles so inconsistent with them. Nor can they oblige us to an Assent to



to those *Prayers* as *Conditions* of our *Communion* with them till they have first made them *consistent* with the *Principles* of our *Communion*.

You further suggest, that <sup>20.</sup> the *Purity* of the *Christian Wor-* Our Dissent to the Impure Prayers will secure us from the Impurity of the Worship.  
*ship* is of as much *Concernment* to the *Honour* of *God*, and the *Salvation* of *Souls*, as the *Purity* of the *Christian Faith*; and that the *Bishops* of the *Catholick Church* are as much oblig'd to provide for the *Preservation* of the one as of the other. I know no *Necessity* of entering into the *Dispute* whether both those *Duties* be *equally* obliging: It is sufficient to grant you that *Bishops* are oblig'd to take *Care* of both, though perhaps not *Equally*. But I take the *Design* of our present *Dis-*  
L 2                    pute

pute to concern our *own* Duty, not that of our *Holy Fathers*. That they *themselves* are the most competent *Judges* of. And *none* are like to be concerned in *the Case in View*. Then we shall all be *private Communicants*, when we have no *Principles* of *Unity* to *Head* us as a *Distinct Communion*. And, when we are so, it will be *sufficient* for our *Security* if we can preserve our *selves* from the *Contagion* of the *Immoral Prayers*. And for securing us from that, you need only to recollect what has been already proved. I have shewn the *Communion* itself not chargeable with those *Prayers*, because they are *contrary* to the *Principles* of the *Communion* as a *Distinct Communion*.

nion. Thence it plainly follows that our *communicating* with the *Body* wherein they are *used*, is not alone sufficient to *involve* us in the *Guilt* of them. Thence I proved further, that the *Affent* signified by answering *Amen* to those *Impure Prayers* is the only thing that can *pollute* us: This, as it is against our *Principles*, so it is in our own *Power* to secure our selves from it. Thus I think I have gone through all the *Difficulties* of your *Objection*; at least so far as I can *foresee* them. Nor have I any thing more to add, but my heartiest *Prayers*, that *God* will be pleased to make our little *Flock* *numerous* when we come to  
Pra-

*Practice.* In this I hope you will be pleased to second me with your more efficacious *Sacerdotal Intercessions*, in which you will vouchsafe particularly to remember the meanest of your Brethren in this *Excellent Cause*.

6 AP 58

**F I N I S.**

---

**BOOKS**



*BOOKS Printed for*  
George Sawbridge, at  
*the Three Flower-de-*  
*Luces in Little-Bri-*  
*tain.*

**T**HE Ax laid to the  
Root of the Tree:  
Or, a Discourse wherein  
the Anabaptists Mission and  
Ministry are Examined and  
Disprov'd, their Argu-  
ments for it Refuted at  
large, their Grounds of Se-  
paration from the Church  
of *England* demonstrated to  
the *Slanders*, and the Matter  
of them most justly *retorted*  
upon themselves, as altoge-  
ther inconsistent with the  
Notion of a *Christian Church*,  
and

and in creating a Constant and Indelible Prejudice against *Communion* with them. Wherein likewise the *Unity* of the Church, and *Evangelical Priesthood*, are asserted against them and all other *Sectaries*, of whatsoever Denomination.

Moderation in Fashion :  
Or, an Answer to a Treatise written by Mr. *Francis Talents*, Entituled, a short History of Schism, &c. wherein his Scandalous Abuse of the *Primitive Fathers*, and all *Ecclesiastical Antiquity*, is plainly Detected and Refuted ; and the Case of the present Schism, and of *Occasional Conformity*, is fairly Stated, and clearly Resolved. By S. G. a Presbyter of the Church of *England*.

F I N I S.

t  
-  
y  
-  
h  
r  
-  
:  
e  
-  
-  
e  
-  
y  
d  
,  
s  
y  
-  
- )